



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/045,178

01/11/2002

Noriyuki Kasahara

0072601-000005

7589

26138

7590

04/01/2009

Joseph R. Baker, APC

Gavrilovich, Dodd & Lindsey LLP

4660 La Jolla Village Drive, Suite 750

San Diego, CA 92122

EXAMINER

POPA, ILEANA

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1633

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

04/01/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/045,178	KASAHARA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	ILEANA POPA	1633	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) ILEANA POPA.

(3) Joseph Baker.

(2) Joseph Woitach.

(4) Noriyuki Kasahara; Douglas Jolly.

Date of Interview: 26 March 2009.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☒ Yes e) ☐ No.

If Yes, brief description: Applicant provided data demonstrating the efficeincy and stability of the claimed vecto.

Claim(s) discussed: All pending claims.

Identification of prior art discussed: Ram et al. (Cancer Res., 1993, 53: 83-88); Martuza et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,585,096); Murakami et al. (Gene, 1997, 202: 23-29).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant submitted that the claimed vector would not have been obvious over the prior art because the prior art taught against inserting foreign genes into replication competent mammalian retroviral vectors. Applicant was informed that his arguments and evidence would be given fair consideration once formally submitted.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Ileana Popa/
Examiner, Art Unit 1633